OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PROGRAM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES BOARD/UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION
CONFERENCE ROOM
2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 2F
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107
NOVEMBER 16, 2015 - 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Greg Armstrong (left at 3:50 p.m.), Ross Barrick, Mitchell Hort, Joe McKenzie (arrived at 1:39 p.m.), Eric Pollard (left at 3:40 p.m.), Tom Sewell, Adam Shupe, and Cary Williamson

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
None

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Tony Blatt, Craiton Cooper, Paula Laney-Cowart, Dave Evans, Terrance Hellman, Robert Lassiter, and Jeremy Moore

OTHERS PRESENT:
Billy Pope (Staff – OUBCC), Terri Bennett (Staff - OUBCC), and Scott Minton (OnCue Express)

CALL TO ORDER:
Mr. Mitchell Hort called the meeting of the Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Construction Industries Board/Uniform Building Code Commission Board Room at Shepherd Mall, 2401 NW 23rd St., Suite 2F, Oklahoma City, OK 73107.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS:

<u>Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #10 on Sections 2303.2 (Emergency disconnect switches) and 2303.2.1 (Local emergency disconnect switches)</u>
Mr. Hort stated Mr. Shupe tried to make the adjustments everyone asked for. He asked if everyone had time to read the comment forms, if they agreed with the proposed modifications or if there were any other comments. Mr. Sewell asked if he understood the comment form which stated an ESD was required within twenty feet of the dispensing unit, all of the same type fuels needed to be interconnected, as well as any other dispensing unit within twenty feet of the button. Mr. Shupe replied that was correct, that it would include mixed fuel types that were installed on the island and if the button said it was an emergency shut down, it would shut down everything on that island. Mr. Sewell asked if the change would not require all fuel types in the facility to be interconnected if they were farther than twenty feet from the ESD. Mr. Shupe agreed that was correct. Mr. Sewell cited an example and Mr. Shupe disagreed with his example and said that wasn't the intent of the change. Mr. Sewell asked in most cases when the power was dropped out, there was still a hot wire to the button and was the expectation that when the power was dropped it would cascade and eventually drop that hot wire to the line side of the button. Mr. Shupe replied he couldn't answer that question. Mr. Sewell noted he was fine either way; he just wanted to

clarify it so everyone understood it the same way. Mr. Hort noted the button would cut the power to the pumps. Mr. Shupe noted it was expanded on in the next comment form and read the requirements. Mr. Sewell noted that would require the relays to be cascaded. Mr. Shupe noted that he didn't come up with the language, just collected and put it together. Mr. Sewell noted when reading NFPA 70®, that's what he got was the understanding. Mr. Minton asked if that button would typically be inside the classified zone. Mr. Sewell noted on a CNG dispenser, if it was more than five feet away it was outside of that zone. He noted if it was a button in the compressor area it could very easily be within fifteen feet of the compressor. Mr. Minton stated after last month's meeting, he went back and asked his engineers and operations people and in the areas where OnCue operates, they only had one municipality that required an ESD for the liquid fuels, which was the City of Norman. He noted every other station in his operating area did not require any emergency shutdown device for liquid fuels. He noted they had them on all of their CNG pumps but did not have them on the liquid fuels except in Norman. He added when discussing the interlocking of the devices, there were no other buttons to connect. He noted the liquid fuel pumps were not designed to be shut off with a button and would require coming back in to retrofit the pumps with an electronic shutoff device. He noted it would be costly; between $500 to $1000 per dispenser. Mr. Shupe noted the change would not be retroactive and if CNG dispensers were not installed on an existing island with liquid fuels, they would not need to be interconnected. Mr. Minton noted if it was not retroactive it wouldn’t be that big of a problem since they were not installing them on the same islands, but there were a lot of companies that were doing that. Mr. Minton noted for his liquid fuel stores, they could shut off power to everything from inside the store, but there was nothing outside the store. Mr. Sewell noted when his company was wiring for liquid fuels, not everyone enforced the requirement for an ESD outside the building. Mr. Minton noted the ESDs for the liquid fuel dispensers only shut off the flow of the fuel at the dispenser, and didn’t necessarily shut off anything at the dispenser.

Mr. Shupe noted his modification was in relation to CNG under section 2308 and he didn't think it would influence the liquid fuel side of things. Mr. Sewell asked if when the ESD shut off the gasoline pumps, would that device shut off the signal circuits going to the console. He added his company figured out how to do it at the compressor but the signal circuit was almost expensive as getting into the power circuits. Mr. Williamson noted the fire code said it had to stop the transfer of fuel for liquid fuel. Mr. Sewell noted a lot of the compressors were set to call out for help if something occurred and if the signal was broken there would be no call, unless a separate system was developed. Mr. Williamson noted the requirements for CNG said the ESD would shut off the power supply to the compressor and close valves between the main gas supply and the compressor and between the storage containers and the compressors. Mr. Sewell noted it wouldn't be a problem, it just needed to be clearly understood how the systems would work and make sure it was uniformly enforced. Mr. Minton asked generally speaking if power was out, did the valves close. Mr. Sewell noted that all valves were automatically closed; they were powered to open and had a spring to close. There was further discussion on the valve types and purging systems.

Mr. Barrick noted the way he read AFPTC #10 was adding a new section 2303.2.1. He added he thought it came out of the discussion regarding ESDs that were installed on the dispenser or inside the twenty feet. He noted it was so there wouldn't be an issue with the authority having jurisdiction if they were there, but they were not mandatory. He noted if they were there they had to be interlocked. Mr. Shupe agreed and said the only reason AFPTC #11 was brought up in discussing it was to make sure if #11 was approved, the constructability passed to a certain extent.

Mr. Shupe noted the original reason for the exception was to make sure if the switch was hit, that everything on that island was shut off. There was further discussion on the requirements for the ESDs to drop power. Mr. Sewell noted when his company wired stations all the power was dropped, except the signal wire. He added they didn't mess with an internet cable or a data line.

MR. ROSS BARRICK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. GREG ARMSTRONG TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AFPTC #10

Mr. Shupe noted there was one grammar correction where a few words were repeated.

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Eric Pollard
	Ross Barrick	Tom Sewell
	Mitchell Hort	Adam Shupe
	Joe McKenzie	Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Anthony Blatt	Terrance Hellman
	Paula Laney-Cowart	Jeremy Moore
ABSTAIN:	None	

<u>Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #11 on Sections 2308.7 (Emergency shutdown devices), 2308.7.1 (Remote emergency shutdown device), and 2308.7.2 (Local emergency shutdown device)</u>

Mr. Shupe gave a quick history of the last discussion which centered on identifying the two switches, one as a remote switch and one as a local. He added instead of editing Section 2308.7 to be very confusing, he pulled out the requirements where each switch was to be located into subparagraphs 2308.7.1 and 2308.7.2. He noted within those paragraphs were the distance requirements, which could be changed. He noted the local disconnect listed the ESD within 10 feet, which matched the most stringent code, but he wasn't sure which one. Mr. Barrick noted it was NFPA 52 that required the 10 feet. Mr. Sewell noted he remembered discussion about defining the dispensing area and now the requirement was from the dispensing device not within the dispensing area. Mr. Shupe noted the committee discussed it at the last meeting. Mr. Sewell asked if the device was defined as the actual cabinet or the stretched out tip of the hose. Mr. Shupe said the cabinet since the dispensing area probably would be looking at the end of the hose. The committee discussed if the wording should be revised to clarify what the 10 feet was from; if there was a need to address fast- and slow-fill systems separately and adding an exception for the slow-fill situation; using the correct terminology for the system type which should be "time-fill." The committee discussed several different ways of modifying the language for the section, discussing the definitions of dispensing area and dispensing enclosure and if those would have an issue with time-fill applications. At the end of the discussion committee consensus was to modify in Section 2308.7.1, the word "dispensers" to "dispensing enclosures," in both the section and the exception, and in Section 2308.7.2 changing the term "dispensing device" to "dispensing enclosure." The committee then discussed creating an exception for time-fill situations. The committee discussed putting the section under 2308.7, with the final wording as: "In time-fill applications in lieu of a

defined remote and local emergency manual shutdown device, an emergency manual shutdown device shall be provided within 50 feet of each fixed point of dispensing hose attachment."

There was discussion on the draft language covering how close the dispensing poles in a time-fill set up could be to the compressor; if both time-fill and fast-fill could be set up at the same location and if that happened were the buttons interlinked; and on service switches and stop buttons on compressors and the differences between the two. At the end of the discussion, the wording "and located in the compressor area" was added to the end of the proposed exception as it was not defined in the remote area except for in 2308.7.1. There was further discussion on the exception and the final version of the exception read as follows: "Exception. In time-fill applications, in lieu of a defined remote and local emergency manual shutdown device, an emergency manual shutdown device shall be provided within 50 feet of each fixed point of dispensing hose attachment and located on the inside and outside surface of the compressor fence within 10 feet of the main access gate." Mr. Shupe read aloud the modified language, including exceptions for Sections 2308.7, 2308.7.1 and 2308.7.2. There was further discussion regarding the number of feet between the ESDs and the dispensing cabinets and that Mr. Shupe would provide a clean copy of the comment form to Ms. Bennett with all the amendments discussed.

MR. WILLIAMSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. GREG ARMSTRONG TO APPROVE THE PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AS AMENDED

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Tom Sewell
	Ross Barrick	Adam Shupe
	Mitchell Hort	Cary Williamson
	Joe McKenzie	
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Anthony Blatt	Jeremy Moore
	Paula Laney-Cowart	Eric Pollard
	Terrance Hellman	
ABSTAIN:	None	

<u>Discussion and possible action on any issues found in the comparison of NFPA 52, Chapters 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 (formally NFPA 57 A® - Standard for the Production, Storage, and Handling of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)®, 1999 Edition) and the 2014 Edition of the National Electrical Code® and the 2015 Editions of the International Fire Code® and International Fuel Gas Code®</u>
Mr. Shupe asked if the right people were present who were familiar with Liquid Natural Gas to have a discussion. Mr. Hort replied the Department of Labor members were familiar with it. Mr. Williamson asked if the item could be tabled until they were available for the discussion. Mr. Shupe asked what application the committee would be looking at it for because in his limited understanding of LNG was that it was very cold and mainly the new form of transportation for large amounts. He asked if the application would only be if some station or someone was storing a liquefied version that would then be converted. Mr. Sewell replied there were tractor trailers and city buses running on LNG. He added the boil off was utilized as well called LCNG. He noted there was a company trying to get a permit to put an LNG manufacturing plant in Stroud,

Oklahoma. The committee determined there was an LNG fueling station in the state so the committee would need to review the requirements, but the consensus was to wait until the others were available. Mr. Hort tabled the discussion.

Assignment of review for the December 14, 2015 meeting
The same assignment was carried forward for review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:52 p.m.
The meeting was adjourned without a motion or a vote as there was no longer a quorum present.

Minutes approved in Committee Meeting on the 14th day of December, 2015

MITCHELL HORT
Mr. Mitchell Hort, Chairman
Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee

PREPARED BY: TERRI BENNETT
Ms. Terri Bennet, Administrative Assistant
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission

OFFICIAL COPY: *Original with signature in office file.*